

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/724,841	Applicant(s) GRABSTEIN ET AL.	
	Examiner Prema M. Mertz	Art Unit 1646	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Prema M. Mertz (Primary Examiner). (3)_____.

(2) Jane E.R. Potter (Attorney). (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 30 January 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 20-30,34,35 and 41-45.

Identification of prior art discussed: Smith et al. (1991).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The 35 USC 112, first paragraph, written description rejection over claims 20-25, the 35 USC 112, first paragraph, lack of enablement rejection over claims 20-30, 34-35, 41-45, the 35 USC 112, first paragraph, written description rejection over claims 41-45, the 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejection and the 35 USC 102(b) rejection over claims 20-22, 26-27, 34-35 and 41-45 as being anticipated by Smith et al, were discussed. Attorney was informed that amending claim 20 to recite "at least 18 contiguous nucleotides" would obviate the 35 USC 102(b) rejection.